

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q79233

Ryosaku FUJISATO

Allowed: May 29, 2009

Appln. No.: 10/771,444

Group Art Unit: 3761

Confirmation No.: 3823

Examiner: Ginger T. Chapman

Filed: February 5, 2004

For: SUCTION-CLEANSING DEVICE AND CLEANSING APPARATUS HAVING THE
SAME

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

ATTN: MAIL STOP FEE

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

REMARKS

Applicant offers the following comments in response to the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance set forth on pages 2-6 of the Notice of Allowability, dated May 29, 2009. The Reasons for Allowance merely loosely paraphrase claims and inappropriately combine the features of separate claims and thus, do not accurately restate the claimed invention, as set forth in each of the independent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the present application are patentable for the unique features explicitly recited in each of the claims. Each claim should be interpreted using its own precise language, without inferring any particular emphasis from the Examiner's statement or reading limitations into the claim from the Examiner's statement.

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

U.S. Application No.: 10/771,444

Attorney Docket No.: Q79233

Further, Applicant does not admit to the characterization of the teachings of Kostrov, Martin, and Henkin set forth by the Examiner in the Statement.

Patent Office personnel are requested to note that the present submission does not adversely affect the patent term adjustment accrued by the Applicant to date. As emphasized in the “Clarification of 37 C.F.R. §1.704(c)(10) – Reduction of Patent Term Adjustment for Certain Types of Papers Filed After a Notice of Allowance Has Been Mailed,” 1247OG111 (6/26/01), “a response to the examiner’s reasons for allowance” is an example of a paper that does “not cause substantial interference and delay in the patent issue process” and is “not considered a ‘failure to engage in reasonable efforts’ to conclude processing or examination of the application.” Therefore, the Applicant remains entitled to the full patent term adjustment set forth in the Notice of Allowance dated May 29, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael C. Jones/
Michael C. Jones
Registration No. 63,266

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 7, 2009